



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

HL

APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
--------------------	-------------	-----------------------	---------------------

09/049,865 03/27/98 WEBER

C 47765/C/JFW/

EXAMINER

HM22/0809

ALBERT WAI-KIT CHAN
COOPER & DUNHAM
1185 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS
NEW YORK NY 10036

ART UNIT VIS. PAPER NUMBER

5

DATE MAILED: 1642

08/09/99

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

OFFICE ACTION SUMMARY

- ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 D.C. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire _____ month(s) or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-23, 43-53 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☒ Claims 1-23, 43-53 are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
- ☐ received.
- ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____
- ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

- ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of Reference Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449. Paper No(s). _____
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

Art Unit: 1642

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restriction

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

Election of the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention is required:

A) Hollow fiber, a disc, a sphere, or a microcapsule.

B) Cells secreting a hormone, or any of the following endocrine cells: insulin-producing cells, hepatocytes, parathyroid cells, pituitary cells, or any of the following neuroectodermal cells: adrenal cells, lymphocytes.

C) Cells that are not genetically engineered, or cells that are genetically engineered.

2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reason:

Hollow fiber, a disc, a sphere, or a microcapsule are structurally distinct from each others. Furthermore, since the claimed microcapsule is improved by increasing the pore sizes, and since hollow fiber, a disc, and a sphere do not necessary have the same pore size as the claimed microcapsule, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have expected that the claimed method, using the claimed microcapsule, could also be successfully applied to hollow fiber, a disc, and a sphere.

~~The cells of B) are structurally and functionally distinct from each other. One of ordinary~~
skill in the art would not have expected that all the claimed cells could be successfully grafted, and especially could produce hormone or insulin, because each cell has different property.

Art Unit:

Cells that are not genetically engineered are structurally, and functionally distinct from cells that are genetically engineered.

A telephone call was made to John White on March 2, 5, 1999 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made. Applicant is advised that a response to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 USC 103 of the other invention.

Applicants are reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the

Art Unit:

application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a diligently-filed petition under 37 C.F.R. 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 C.F.R. 1.17(h).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Minh-Tam B. Davis whose telephone number is (703) 305-2008. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 10: 00 am to 2:00 pm, except on Wednesday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paula Hutzell, can be reached on (703) 308-4310. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-4227.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [Paula.Hutzell@uspto.gov].

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless **the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122**. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Art Unit:

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0916.

Minh-Tam B. Davis

June 3, 1999


PAULA K. HUTZELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER